UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,099	08/01/2003	Richard O. Chen	27763-705.501	1917
	7590 09/12/200 SINI GOODRICH & F	EXAMINER		
650 PAGE MILL ROAD			RIGGS II, LARRY D	
PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1050			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1631	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/632,099	CHEN ET AL.		
zammer milatea merview cammary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	LARRY D. RIGGS II	1631		
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_		
(1) <u>LARRY D. RIGGS II</u> .	(3)			
(2) <u>Paul Borchardt</u> .	(4)			
Date of Interview: <u>11 September 2008</u>	Time:			
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)			
Part I.				
Rejection(s) discussed:				
Claims discussed: Claims 57 and 58				
Prior art documents discussed:				
Part II.				
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:		
Part III.				
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary</li> </ul>	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview		
/Larry D. Riggs II/ Larry D. Riggs II, Ph.D., J.D. Examiner, Art Unit 1631				
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Riggs explained that while the original invention elected on 19 October 2007 were claims 1-32 and 58, the Office Action mailed 19 November 2007 mistakenly rejected the elements of claim 58 but mistakenly referred to claim 57. Subsequently, amended claims received 19 May 2008 mistakenly mislabeled claim 58 as claim 57 while still encompassing the elements of the original claim 58, and subsequently cancelling claim 58. Attorney Borchardt agreed to have the currently amended claim 57, correctly labeled as claim 58. Likewise, attorney Borchardt agreed that claims 6, 10-12, 15-57 and 59-61 are cancelled and claims 1-5, 7-9, 13, 14 and 58 are currently pending and under consideration..